

STATUS OF THE APPLICATION AND CLAIMS

Claims 2-4 and 6-11 are pending.

Claims 6 and 7 are currently amended.

Claims 2-4 and 8-10 have been previously presented.

Claims 1 and 5 have been canceled.

Claim 11 is an original claim.

The claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yokota et al., JP 58-034870, *hereinafter* Yokota.

Applicants' invention is directed toward a powder coating composition of at least one polysiloxane and at least one high temperature matrix material of inorganic crystalline particles of hollow spheroids or solid spheroids. In contrast, the compositions of Yokota are formed from glass powder. Glass is not an inorganic crystalline particle but an amorphous particle as clearly shown in the Wikipedia encyclopedia (copy attached). Wikipedia states "**Glass** in the *common* sense refers to a hard, brittle, transparent amorphous solid" (emphasis added).

Further, the crystalline particles used by Applicants are hollow or solid spheroids and not jagged glass powder particles as taught by Yokota. Applicants' novel composition as set forth in the amended claims is directed to crystalline particles that are hollow or solid spheroids and not amorphous glass powder particles. See specification page 6, lines 34-36. The spheroidal crystalline particles used in Applicants' composition are totally different from the amorphous glass powder particles used by Yokota and certainly are not obvious in view of the teaching of Yokota. There is no teaching or suggestion in Yokota that hollow or solid spherical inorganic crystalline particles as set forth in the amended claims can be used to form a powder coating composition. Yokota only teaches the use of amorphous glass powder particles which are totally different from the claimed hollow or solid spheroidal inorganic crystalline used in Applicants powder coating composition.


Also, Yokota requires the use of a heat resistant inorganic substance, such as alumina (aluminum oxide) to provide a strong ceramic film. Applicants' powder coating does not require such a composition.

In view of the amendments to the claims and the above discussion pointing out the patentable differences between Applicants' claimed invention and Yokota, the obviousness rejection based on Yokota must be withdrawn and pending claims allowed.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance. In order to expedite disposition of this case, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number below to resolve any remaining issues. Should there be a fee due which is not accounted for, please charge such fee to Deposit Account No. 04-1928 (E.I. du Pont de Nemours and Company).

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Hilmar L. Fricke
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No.: 22,384
Telephone: (302) 984-6058
Facsimile: (302) 658-1192

Dated: November 24, 2008